



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

---

VOLUME XXXVI

MARCH, 1921

---

NUMBER 3

## GARRICK, COLMAN, AND *THE CLANDESTINE MARRIAGE*

With the exception of the plays of Goldsmith and Sheridan, *The Clandestine Marriage* was probably the best English comedy of the second half of the eighteenth century. Its authors were George Colman, the elder, and David Garrick, respectively one of the most widely known dramatists of his generation and one of the greatest actors that England has produced. The part each had in the writing of the play was in dispute even during their lives, and has remained in dispute until the present. It is my purpose to examine the evidence both internal and external that has any bearing upon the indebtedness of the play to each of its two authors, and to state the conclusions that can be drawn from such an examination.

Since much of the discussion will pre-suppose familiarity with the details of this now slightly known play, it will be advisable to give a brief account of the plot:

Fanny Sterling, the daughter of a rich city-merchant, has been clandestinely married to Lovewell, a worthy but impecunious kinsman of an amorous nobleman, Lord Ogleby. Sir John Melvil, a nephew of Lord Ogleby, and the lord himself accompanied by Canton, a Swiss valet, and Brush, another servant, arrive at the Sterling house to complete arrangements for Sir John's marriage with Miss Sterling, Fanny's elder sister. Unfortunately, Sir John, upon seeing Fanny, falls in love with her, and is discovered by the elder sister on his knees before her. The sister is naturally very indignant. Because of parental objection to Lovewell, it seems unwise to announce the marriage, even though Fanny is with child. Fanny and Lovewell decide that in order to warn Sir John, she should explain the whole affair to Lord Ogleby. While she is telling Lord

Ogleby the story, however, she is interrupted at a point which makes it seem to the lord that she is really in love with him. The denouement comes when Lovewell is discovered in Fanny's room. The whole situation is cleared satisfactorily for Fanny and her husband. Other characters are Mrs. Heidelberg, the vulgar widowed sister of Sterling, a chambermaid, several lawyers, and Betty, Fanny's maid and confidante.

The play was first produced at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane on February 20, 1766 ([Genest, J.,] *Some Account of the English Stage, from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830*. In ten volumes. Bath, 1832. vol. v, pp. 92-3). It was later printed as by George Colman and David Garrick, with the motto on the title-page,

*Huc adhibe vultus, et in unâ parce duobus:  
Vivat, et ejusdem simus uterque parens!*

It was reviewed in *The Critical Review*, vol. XXI, pp. 221-225.

The author of the article on *The Clandestine Marriage* in *Biographia Dramatica* makes certain remarkable statements about the respective parts of Colman and Garrick in the play. He says, "We have usually heard that Garrick's share of this piece was Lord Ogleby and the courtly family; and Colman's, Sterling and the city family. But the following was related to us by a gentleman who declared that it was from the mouth of Mr. Colman himself; 'Garrick composed two acts, which he sent to me, desiring me to *put them together*, or do what I would with them. I did put them together, for I put them into the fire, and wrote the play myself'" (*Biographia Dramatica; or a Companion to the Playhouse* . . . Originally compiled, to the year 1764, by David Erskine Baker, Continued thence to 1782, by Isaac Reed, F. A. S. And brought down to the End of November 1811 . . . by Stephen Jones. In 3 volumes. London, 1812. vol. II, p. 106). In the discussion of *False Concord*, a farce by the Rev. James Towneley, acted at Covent Garden, March 20, 1764, and not printed, it is noted that "It is worthy of remark, that in this farce were three characters (Lord Lavender, Mr. Sudley an enriched soap-boiler, and a pert valet) which were afterwards transplanted, with the dialogue of some scenes, nearly *verbatim*, into *The Clandestine Marriage* (brought out two years afterwards), under the names of Lord Ogleby, Mr. Sterling, and Brush" (*ib.* p. 218). This alleged fact was disclosed by "Mr. Roberdeau in his *Fugitive Verse and*

*Prose*, 1801; Mr. R. having married a daughter of the late Mr. Towneley" (*ib.*).

When George Colman, the younger, in 1820, published in London *Posthumous Letters from Various Celebrated Men; Addressed to Francis Colman, and George Colman, the Elder*, he did not allow such statements as these to pass unchallenged. In the *Addenda* to his volume he printed a defence of his father which included in his father's handwriting a document submitted to David Garrick apparently before the play was begun. In this document, Colman suggests numerous details concerning both characters and plot.

In his discussion of the characters, Colman first of all suggests that the Earl of Oldsap—to be played by Garrick—should be an old Lord who thinks every woman in love with him. Because of this belief he ogles at every woman he meets. Colman completes his remarks about the earl with this significant statement: "But this notion you are more fully possest of than I" (*Posthumous Letters*, p. 334). He then mentions as the other characters, Lord Sapplin, son of the Lord; Traffick, a rich city merchant, anxious to be thought "generous and genteel, w<sup>ch</sup> serves more effectually to expose his Bourgeoise manners"; Lovewell "privately married to Miss Bride—warm, and sensible" [it will be noted that Colman sometimes substitutes for the names of the characters the names of the actors who were to play the parts, J. M. B.]; "Mrs. Clive, Kennedy, or Bradshaw—Sister to Traffick—and something of the same character in Petticoats—only that he is rough & hearty in his manner, & she affects to be delicate & refined. Her dialect is particularly vulgar, aiming at the same time to be fine, not by murdering words in the slip-slop way, but by a mean twang in the pronunciation, as *Qualaty*—*famaly*, &c": "Miss Pope—eldest daughter to Traffick, a keen smart girl, full of spirit, sense, wit, humour, mischief, & malice": "Miss Bride—youngest daughter to Traffick,—a sensible girl, of a soft & amiable temper, not without proper spirit."

Turning from the characters, Colman proceeds to make a rough draught of the general scheme of the play: "A Treaty of Marriage is supposed to be set on foot between the Court and City Family, in w<sup>ch</sup> it is intended that Lord Sapplin, Garrick's Son, shall be married to Miss Pope, eldest daughter to Traffick; It

happens, however, that the young Lord has contracted a violent affection for Miss Bride, who is *before the beginning* of this play clandestinely married to Lovewell. The efforts made by Lord Sapplin to bring about his match with Miss Bride, instead of Miss Pope—the perplexities arising therefrom to the young Couple, Lovewell and Miss Bride—the growing jealousy, & malicious artifices of Miss Pope—& then naturally involving the old Earl (Garrick) in circumstances tending to shew his character—together with the part wch Traffick & his Sister may naturally take in this affair—to make up the Story of the Play.”

Colman comments upon the fact that he is simply making a sketch of his plan, that his purpose is “merely to enable you to think in the same train with me: & that you may be still better acquainted with *the stuff of my thoughts*, I have here subjoined some loose hints of Acts, Scenes, manner of conducting the Story, of shewing the characters to advantage, &c” (*ib.* p. 336). He suggests that perhaps the plot might be still further “pleasantly embarrassed by introducing a character (a *good* one) openly intended to be married to Miss Bride.” The result of this plan he believes would be to make the situation of Lovewell and Miss Bride more difficult and would direct Miss Pope’s jealousy to the wrong object.

In quoting Colman’s hints for the Acts and Scenes, I shall italicize the details that were incorporated in the finished play. In Act I *he wishes to let the audience know* (1) *of the marriage* and (2) *of Lord Sapplin’s attachment to Bride instead of to his intended wife* [inserted in Act II]. He suggests that this will best be done and Lovewell will be raised somewhat above the others *if the latter is made a relative, perhaps nephew of the earl. Because of this relationship the young lord will the more naturally make him his confidant.* Furthermore, *the old earl could be shown dressing* [inserted in Act II], “& he might speak of himself—hold his son cheap as a man of gallantry—talk of what *he cd do with the women—that even now all the family are more in love with him, &c, &c—a short lawyer scene (à la Hogarth)* with some family-strokes on mortgages, settlements &c might perhaps be introduced [inserted in Act III]. *If the City Family are at all produced in this Act, they may be supposed in expectation of the arrival of the Lords—Preparations making on all hands—Traffick*

*talking of his venison, turbot, pine-apples, &c. His sister on tenterhooks to receive persons of family & Miss Pope's Elevation & Pride abt her noble match, & contempt of her sister—&c*" (ib. p. 338).

For Act II, Colman suggests that *the Lords should have arrived between Acts I and II*, and that in Act II, Scene I, Oldsap be shown with the women. *A humorous scene might be produced by having Traffick show his garden and remark upon the modern improvements in it.* Colman says, "You will not find many materials for this in y<sup>r</sup> own garden at Hampton; but you may among y<sup>r</sup> neighbors." *Lord Sapplin might find a chance to make a declaration to Miss Bride—she will speak of the indelicacy of his transferring his attentions to her, and will not encourage him. Miss Pope is to be aroused to jealousy by some incident and will then become incensed against both Lord Sapplin and her sister.*

At the beginning of his remarks upon Act III, Colman says, "N. B. Though I mark the acts thus, I by no means wd suggest to you that I have here planned out anything like the form of the business of the Play" (ib. p. 339). He suggests that *Lovewell and Miss Bride shall decide that since Lord Oldsap apparently has taken a kindly interest in her, she should tell him of Lord Sapplin's attentions and also of her marriage. While she is telling the first part, she becomes embarrassed, and leaving without a full confession, leads him to think when she says her affections are elsewhere, that she is in love with him. Miss Pope may complain to him of Lord Sapplin and Miss Bride, but in that case Lord Oldsap will deny this and say he can tell her where Miss Bride's affections are placed.* Colman believes that if the character intended to be married to Miss Bride were now introduced, he might be used as a tool by Miss Pope if she should tell him of the wrong that was being planned against her, and should ask him to counteract the plot. *Miss Bride and Lovewell agree that Lovewell shall now tell Lord Oldsap of the marriage, but before he can get fully under way, Lord Oldsap confesses his love for Miss Bride. Lord Oldsap is to break the whole matter to the family, by speaking to Traffic's sister, who first thinks he is making love to her. When she finds she is mistaken, she treats him with contempt.*

Colman ends his paper by remarking, "Of the Denouement I have not as yet even conceived those imperfect ideas I have got of

some other parts. Think of the whole, & think in my train, if it appears worth while, & when you have thrown yr thoughts on paper, as I have done mine, we will lay our heads together, Brother Bayes."

The younger Colman believed that it was after a consultation with Garrick that his father wrote the latter part of the following Loose Hints of Act V:

"Scene of Sterling, Ogleby, lawyers &c on filling up blanks, & settling all the clauses of the settlement—disputes arise, & Sterling ag<sup>st</sup> both matches, declaring that he will not marry his family into a Chancery suit—in the midst of their disputes enter Miss Sterling laughing immoderately, & brings in Betty trembling, who, being *interrogated* discovers the whole of the Clandestine Marriage.

#### V.

"Lovewell, & Fanny, & Betty in Fanny's apartment—Betty may tell them that Mrs Lettice has been pumping her—Lovewell tells Fanny that finding the misconstruction of Ld. O., he was just on the point of explanation when Sir John appeared—but that he will certainly break it the next morning to Sir John—& this night shall conclude her anxieties on the clandestine marriage—(sc. 2). Another apartment, Miss Sterling & Mrs H. in their night-cloaths [sic]—to them Lettice, who tells them she has been on the watch, & saw a man go into Miss Fanny's room—They immediately conclude it to be Sir John—& Miss Sterling resolves to expose her sister & Sir John—the family alarmed—various night figures—Betty brought in trembling, who discovers the whole affair—then Lovewell & at length Fanny, who being pardoned, Sir John's match breaks off, & the piece concludes by Sterling & Ogleby both joining in good humour about Fanny & Lovewell" (*ib.* pp. 343-4).

From even a most casual comparison of the completed play with the notes sent by Colman to Garrick, it is evident that whichever author wrote the first three acts, Colman was responsible for the early part of the plot in almost every respect. In Act I, Fanny and Betty let the audience into the secret at once. Lovewell is made a kinsman of Lord Ogleby. The Sterling family is preparing to receive the distinguished guests. Sterling, as pre-arranged, discusses the food for his dinner: "But, pray, sister Heidelberg, let the turtle be drest to-morrow, and some venison; and let the gardener cut some pine-apples, and get out some ice. I'll answer for wine, I warrant you: I'll give them such a glass of Champagne as they never drank in their lives; no, not at a duke's

table" (*The Dramatick* [sic] *Works of George Colman*. In four volumes, London, 1777. Vol. 1, p. 179).

The characters of Mrs. Heidelberg, Miss Sterling, and Lord Ogleby as elaborated in Act I and the following acts are simply amplifications of Colman's notes. When Mrs. Heidelberg speaks to the housekeeper, Mrs. Trusty, about the anticipated arrival of the guests, she says, "Oh, here, Trusty; do you know that people of qualaty are expected this evening?" (*ib.* p. 175). Or, again, she says to Fanny, "Go, child! you know the qualaty will be here by and by; go, and make yourself a little more fit to be seen [*exit Fanny*]. She is gone away in tears; absolutely crying, I vow and pertest. This ridicalous love! We must put a stop to it. It makes a perfect nataral of the girl" (*ib.* p. 177). Miss Sterling, thinking of her marriage with Sir John, makes her sister exceedingly uncomfortable: "My heart goes pit-a-pat at the very idea of being introduced at court: gilt chariot! pye-balled horses! laced liveries! and then the whispers buzzing round the circle! Who is she? 'Lady Melvil, Ma'am!' Lady Melvil! my ears tingle at the sound . . . if Mr Lovewell and you come together, as I doubt not you will, you will live very comfortably, I dare say . . . perhaps I may meet you in the summer with some other citizens at Tunbridge. For my part, I shall always entertain a proper regard for my relations: You shan't want my countenance, I assure you" (*ib.* pp. 174-5). Miss Sterling's characterization of Ogleby is even more strikingly like Colman's notes: "He is full of attention to the ladies, and smiles, and grins, and leers, and ogles, and fills every wrinkle in his old wizen face with comical expressions of tenderness. I think he would make an admirable sweetheart" (*ib.* pp. 178-9).

The only suggestions not utilized in this act are those of having a lawyer-scene and of showing the old earl dressing. It is interesting, however, that the former is used in Act III and the latter in Act II. The arrival of the lord's servant at the end of Act I prepares for the arrival of the guests between acts as suggested by Colman.

At the beginning of Act II the original plan was modified by the introduction of a servant-scene in Lord Ogleby's ante-chamber, followed by the appearance of the lord himself. The plan is further modified by Sir John's telling Lovewell that upon visiting his room early in the morning he had found it empty. This scene,

as anticipatory to Act V was in all probability suggested by Garrick. After the garden-scene, Sir John admits to Lovewell his love for Fanny, and failing to induce Lovewell to convey a letter to her from him, was in the act of declaring his love to Fanny herself when Miss Sterling discovered him. This scene gave the occasion that Colman desired to arouse Miss Sterling to jealousy.

The lawyer-scene suggested for Act I was inserted in Act III. Mrs. Heidelberg was made a more prominent figure by emphasizing the power she wielded in the family by reason of her money. The relations between Mrs. Heidelberg and the others in the group take up most of this act.

The suggestions made by Colman for Act III, in regard to the complications among Fanny, Lovewell, and Lord Ogleby were followed finally in Act IV, and carried out to the letter. The matter is further complicated by the request that Lord Ogleby makes to Sterling for his daughter's hand.

It is noteworthy that the first suggestions for Act V were not used, except in part for Act IV, and that the last suggestions were followed in the main. The order of disclosure was altered somewhat, however. Betty came out of Fanny's room first, but did not confess. She was followed by Fanny and finally by Lovewell.

From a survey of the internal evidence it is apparent, therefore, that Colman was responsible for the basic characterization of most of the chief *dramatis personae*, including Lord Ogleby, and also for the most important details of the first four acts. For more specific information we must turn to external evidence.

George Colman, the younger, suggests the method which his father and Garrick followed in their collaboration: "The probable process was, that they consulted, first, as to the general plan, and, secondly, as to the conduct of the incidents and scenes; then wrote *separately* and then compared and modified, *together*, what each had composed" (*Posthumous Letters*, p. 333). He states, furthermore, that his father had told him Garrick did not write all of Lord Ogleby, that, for instance, Colman wrote the whole of Lord Ogleby's first scene. This evidence is important, as coming from Colman's son, but his last statement, as we shall see later, is controverted by one of his father's own letters.

The elder Colman's letters from Garrick give considerable information in regard to the progress of the play and the methods of

collaboration. *The Clandestine Marriage* was apparently well under way as early as 1763, for in December of that year Garrick wrote from Naples to Colman, "I have not yet written a word of the fourth or fifth acts of 'The Clandestine Marriage,' but I am thinking much about it" (Peake, R. B., *Memoirs of the Colman Family, including their Correspondence with the most distinguished Personages of their time*. In two volumes. London, 1841, vol. I, p. 93). This reference would place the date of Colman's notes at least three months before the first production of *False Concord* on March 20, 1764, and should dispose of the charge of plagiarism as far as the conception of Lord Ogleby is concerned. It is also significant that Garrick was abroad at the time of the first production of *False Concord*. He wrote to Colman from Rome, April 11, 1764, a very intimate letter in which he said about *The Clandestine Marriage*, "Speed your plough, my dear friend; have you thought of 'The Clandestine Marriage'? I am at it" (*ib.* p. 102). Since Garrick continued abroad during 1764, it is improbable that his part of the play could have been plagiarized. Furthermore, it is probable that had any great part of it been filched from another work, the borrowing would have been exposed at once instead of a half-century later. In a letter from Paris, dated November 10, 1764, Garrick says, "Did you receive my letter about our Comedy? I shall begin, the first moment I find my comic ideas return to me, to divert myself with scribbling; say something to me upon that subject. I have considered our three acts, and with some little alterations they will do; I will ensure them" (*ib.* p. 126).

If we may judge from these letters and from the length of time that elapsed between the inception and completion of the play, it would seem probable that neither author was burningly enthusiastic about his task. By September 24, 1765, however, the work was nearing an end. On that date, Doctor Hoadly, in a letter to Garrick, says, "I am pleased to hear that Mr. Colman's Comedy, two acts of which you shewed me at Hampton some years ago, is in such forwardness, as I found, by his talk at his own house last winter that he had not worked any farther upon it; I did not let him know I had seen any part of it, or was privy to the scheme, which surely is a good one. God bless you both" (*ib.* pp. 156-7).

From the beginning, it would seem that Colman expected Garrick to play the part of Lord Ogleby. For some reason, how-

ever, when the play was completed, the great actor refused to undertake the part. Thomas Davies, Garrick's friend and biographer, attributed his change of mind to his advanced age and his frequent attacks of the gout and stone (Davies, T., *Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick, Esq.* . . . a new Edition in two volumes. London, 1808, vol. II, p. 102). Tate Wilkinson, the actor, said that Garrick wrote the part of Lord Ogleby before he went to Italy. When he returned, he decided not to play that part, both because of his health and also because, "if he himself should play Lord Ogleby, it would lead into applications from authors to request his performing in their pieces; to prevent which, he had come to a determination not to study any new character whatever, and desired Mr. King would do the part" (Wilkinson, T., *Memoirs of his Own Life*. In four volumes, York, 1790, vol. III, p. 254). At first King would not take the rôle, but he was at last persuaded. When he recited part of a scene to Garrick in a tremulous voice, "Garrick was all astonished, and thundered out, 'By G—d, King, if you can but sustain that fictitious manner and voice throughout, it will be one of the greatest performances that ever adorned a British theatre'" (*ib.* p. 255). Peake, the biographer of the Colmans, says that Garrick was unwilling to study a new part, and hints that it may have been because of a resemblance between Lord Ogleby and Lord Chalkstone in Garrick's own play, *Lethe*. He suspects that a meddler carried to Garrick some remarks made by Colman upon his collaborator as a manager (Peake, *op. cit.* vol. I, p. 157).

Whatever was the cause of Garrick's refusal to play the part of Lord Ogleby, his failure to fulfill Colman's expectations brought about a break between the two friends. On November 9, 1765, James Clutterbuck, writing to Garrick, says,

Colman and you are men of most quick sensations, and are apt sometimes to catch at words instead of things, and those very words may probably receive great alterations by the medium through which they pass. I know you love one another, and a third person might call up such explanations as would satisfy ye both; I myself should not doubt being able to do it were we assembled together. He had communicated his griefs (but no acrimony, I assure you) before your letters came and I commiserate his disappointment. Had I not been in the secret of the joint enterprise I suppose he would not have opened his mouth to me; but being so, the comedy

was read to my Molly and me last Wednesday night, and our concern, for that it is not likely to be finished and represented, equalled the delight we had in hearing the piece: I cannot help thinking there is but one person in the world capable of playing Lord Ogleby, *et hinc illae Lachrymae!* but who can help it?" (*The Private Correspondence of David Garrick with the Most Celebrated Persons of his Time*; . . . In two volumes. London, 1831, vol. 1, pp. 206-7).

The most interesting evidence both in regard to this quarrel and in regard to the authorship of *The Clandestine Marriage* is to be found in a letter written by Colman to Garrick, December 4, 1765. It corroborates in every detail the conclusions drawn from the play itself:

Since my return from Bath I have been told, but I can hardly believe it, that, in speaking of 'The Clandestine Marriage,' you have gone so far as to say, 'Colman lays a great stress on his having written this character on purpose for me, suppose it should come out that *I wrote it!*' That the truth should come out is my earnest desire; but I should be extremely sorry, for your sake, that it should come out by such a declaration from you. Of all men in the world, I believe I may venture to say that I should be one of the last to take any thing to myself of which I was not the author . . . but you know that it was not I, but yourself, who desired secrecy in relation to our partnership, and you may remember the reasons you gave for it. You know, too, that on the publication of the play the whole affair was to come out, and that both our names were to appear together on the title-page. . . . In your letter to Clutterbuck . . . you tell him, 'that you had formed a plan of a comedy called *The Sisters*; that if the piece did not succeed, you had promised to take your part, with the shame that might belong to it, to yourself.' I cannot quote the words of your letter, but I am sure I have not misrepresented the purport of it, though the whole is diametrically opposite to my notion of the state of the partnership subsisting between us. You have the plan of 'The Sisters' by you; read it, and see if there are in it any traces of the story of 'The Clandestine Marriage.' You returned me the rough draught which I drew out of that story, and thinking it might be of use in conducting the plot I happened to preserve it: let them be compared, and see what is the resemblance between them. The first plate of Hogarth's 'Marriage à la Mode' was the ground I went upon: I had long wished to see those characters on the stage, and mentioned them as proper objects of comedy, before I had the pleasure of your acquaintance, in a letter written expressly in your defence against the attacks of your old arch enemy Shirley. . . . I understood it was to be a joint work, in the fullest sense of the

word; and never imagined that either of us was to lay his finger on a particular scene, and cry, 'This is mine!' It is true, indeed, that by your suggestion, Hogarth's proud lord was converted into Lord Ogleby, and that, as the play now stands, the levee-scene, at the beginning of the second act, and the whole of the fifth act, are yours: but in the conduct as well as dialogue of the fourth act, I think your favourite, Lord Ogleby, has some obligations to me" (*The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, vol. I, pp. 209-210).

In Garrick's reply to this letter there is no attempt to deny Colman's assertions. Soon, however, the quarrel was over. On the one hand, the actor was able to prove to Colman's satisfaction that he had not intended to injure him; on the other hand, Colman was reconciled to the thought of having King take the part of Lord Ogleby. In less than three months after this letter was written, the play was on the stage.

From an examination of the preceding evidence certain facts are clear. In the first place, the story that Colman burned Garrick's manuscript is absurd. There is absolutely no indication of friction between the men before the play was finished. Had Colman been guilty of such an outrage there would undoubtedly have been some mention of it in their correspondence. In the next place, as has been suggested, the charge of plagiarism falls to the ground (1) because Garrick was not in London during the production of *False Concord* (2) because Colman's plans for the play were conceived before *False Concord* was produced, and (3) because contemporary writers were silent in regard to any hint of plagiarism.

In regard to the play itself it is evident that the draft which has been quoted and that mentioned in Colman's letter of December 4, 1765, are one and the same, and that the conception of *The Clandestine Marriage* as a whole must be credited to Colman. The characters, also, with the exception of the Swiss valet, Canton, and his comrade Brush, owe their individuality largely to him.

The evidence all points toward Garrick's authorship of Act V and the levee-scene in Act II. If he was the author of these portions of the play, it is probable that he was at least largely concerned in the other scenes where Ogleby and Canton appear. Their dialogue is so distinctive and so unvarying that it could not well have been written by two hands. Apparently Garrick had more share in writing Act IV than he had had in writing the

preceding acts, but it is clear from the letter of December 4 and a comparison of the play with the draft, that Colman should be given credit for much of the ground-work. Because of its connection with Act V, we may assume that the scene in which Melvil rallies Lovewell for his nocturnal wanderings is due largely to Garrick.

Further than this we cannot go. It would not be safe to assume that every departure from Colman's early plan is traceable to the superior stagemanship of Garrick. Act V, it is true, is the best act in the play, but Garrick was always at his best in short flights. Unlike Colman, he had not written any long original plays: he delighted in sketches, in re-workings, in short adaptations. Yet in spite of these facts, in those portions of the play where there has been a definite shifting of scenes for dramatic effect, it is probable that Garrick's brain, if not his pen, was the determining factor in the change.

JOSEPH M. BEATTY, JR.

*Goucher College.*

### JUAN DE LUNA'S *LAZARILLO* AND THE FRENCH TRANSLATION OF 1660

In Dr. Chandler's bibliography of romances of roguery, he cites among the early editions in French of the *Lazarillo de Tormes* one dated "1660, Paris, Cotinet (Luna's)."<sup>1</sup> The title-page of this edition reads: LA VIDA DEL (sic) LAZARILLO DE TORMES, y de sus fortunas y adversidades. LA VIE DE LAZARILLE DE TORMES, Et de ses infortunes & aduersitez. Reueuë & corrigée par H. DE LUNE, natif de Castille, Interprete de la Langue Espagnolle. Et traduite en François par L. S. D. A Paris, Chez ARNOVD COTINET, rue des Carmes, au petit Jesus. MDCLX.

The Spanish text, which, according to the title-page, purports to be Luna's emended version of 1620, is printed on the left-hand pages of the book, the French rendering appearing opposite, on the right-hand pages. That the Spanish text as it appears here is the original from which the French translation was made is evident from the exactness with which the two correspond. But

<sup>1</sup> F. W. Chandler, *Romances of Roguery*, New York, 1899, part I, p. 406.